

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified patent application in view of the present amendment and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

By this Amendment, corrected Figs. 1 and 2 are being submitted. This amendment also amends the specification to provide proper antecedent basis for the terminology of the claims. No new matter has been added to the application by the amendment to the specification. All subject matter added to the specification is clearly recognizable by one of ordinary skill in the art from the original disclosure, which includes the specification, drawings, and claims as originally filed. The amendments to the specification overcome the objections to the specification.

This amendment also amends claims 1, 2, 5, 6, and 7 and adds new claim 12. The amendment to claim 2 rewrites claim 2 in independent form. Claim 2 stands rejected as obvious over Stroh, U.S. Patent No. 6,257,795, in view of Sommerer, U.S. Patent No. 5,062,655, and Greubel et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,316,135. This rejection of claim 2 is respectfully traversed.

Stroh, Sommerer, and Greubel et al. all fail to teach or suggest a suspension member with first and second frustoconical surfaces and a stud having a third frustoconical surface in which the first, second, and third frustoconical surfaces all extend at the same angle relative to a longitudinal central axis of the stud, as is recited in claim 2. Since Stroh, Sommerer, and Greubel et al. all fail to

teach or suggest the features of claim 2, a combination of the references also fails to teach or suggest the features.

Therefore, allowance of claim 2 is respectfully requested.

Claims 3 and 4 depend from claim 2 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 2. Additionally, claims 3 and 4 are allowable for the specific limitations of each claim.

Specifically, claim 3 recites that the fourth frustoconical surface also extends at the first angle relative to the longitudinal central axis of the stud. Stroh, Sommerer, and Greubel et al. all fail to teach or suggest the feature of claim 3. Furthermore, the marked-up Fig. 3 that the Examiner attached to the Office Action clearly shows that the angle labeled A23 is only applicable to surface 13 and not to surface 15. Surface 15 of Fig. 3 has the same depth into member 2 as surface 13 but has a wider diameter. Thus, an angle of surface 15, if modified to be frustoconical, would be different from an angle of surface 13, if modified to be frustoconical. Therefore, allowance of claim 3 is respectfully requested.

Claim 4 recites that the third frustoconical surface extends at 45 degrees. In rejecting claim 4, the Examiner notes that surface 12 of Stroh extends from 0 to 90 degrees, which includes 45 degrees. However, this rejection fails to recognize that, in rejecting claim 2, the third surface 12 has been modified to be frustoconical so that surface 12, as modified, no longer extends from 0 to 90 degrees. Moreover, there is no teaching in any of the references for surface 12

to be frustoconical surfaces at 45 degrees. Therefore, allowance of claim 4 is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the first frustoconical surface is angled so that imaginary lines that extend from diametrically opposite portions of the first frustoconical surface intersect at a first location within the through hole and between the first and second side surfaces. The second frustoconical surface is angled so that imaginary lines that extend from diametrically opposite portions of the second frustoconical surface intersect at a second location within the through hole and between the first and second side surfaces. The third frustoconical surface is angled so that, when in engagement with the first frustoconical surface, imaginary lines that extend from diametrically opposite portions of the third frustoconical surface intersect at a third location within the through hole of the second suspension member and between the first and second side surfaces. The fourth frustoconical surface angled so that, when in engagement with the second frustoconical surface, imaginary lines that extend from diametrically opposite portions of the fourth frustoconical surface intersect at a fourth location within the through hole of the second suspension member and between the first and second side surfaces.

Stroh, Sommerer, and Greubel et al. all fail to teach or suggest these features of claim 1. Moreover, the only reference cited by the Examiner that includes a suspension member having first and second frustoconical surfaces is

Sommerer. However, as Fig. 2 of Sommerer clearly shows, imaginary lines extending from diametrically opposite portions of the lowermost frustoconical surface would intersect at a location outside the through hole and well above, as viewed in Fig. 2, the suspension member. Since the references fail to teach or suggest the features of claim 1, a combination of the references also fails to teach or suggest the features.

Therefore, allowance of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 5-12 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Additionally, claims 5-12 are allowable for the specific limitations of the claims.

Specifically, claim 5 recites that the threaded end portion of the stud extends to a shoulder that forms an end of the third frustoconical surface. None of the references teaches or suggests this feature of claim 5. Therefore, allowance of claim 5 is respectfully requested.

Similarly, claim 6 recites that external threads extend to axially to the third frustoconical surface. None of the references teaches or suggests this feature of claim 6.

Therefore, allowance of claim 6 is respectfully requested.

New claim 12 recites that the first and third locations within the through hole of the second suspension member are identical locations and the second and fourth locations within the through hole of the second suspension member are identical locations. None of the references teaches or suggests this feature of claim 12. Therefore, allowance of claim 12 is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted
that the above-identified patent application is in condition
for allowance, and allowance of the above-identified patent
application is respectfully requested.

Please charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment in
the fees for this amendment to our Deposit Account
No. 20-0090.

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel J. Whitman
Reg. No. 43,987

TAROLLI, SUNDHEIM, COVELL,
& TUMMINO L.L.P.
526 Superior Avenue, Suite 1111
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-1400
Phone: (216) 621-2234
Fax: (216) 621-4072
Customer No.: 26,294